

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 20, 2004. Claims 1-8 are pending in this Application and Claims 1-8 stand rejected. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are amended.

Summarizing the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter, "AAPA") in view of Imai (GB Patent No. 2,337,857, hereinafter "Imai").

Applicants thank Examiner George Eng for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on October 5, 2004.<sup>1</sup> During the interview, Amendments to the claims as herein presented were proposed, and arguments as hereinafter developed were presented. Non-limiting support for the subject matter amended into Claim 1 was identified at page 5, lines 16-18 of Applicants' specification.

As explained during the interview, in reference to Claim 1, the claimed holder, comprising at least first and second component holding units connected by a connecting member, expedites the assembly process of portable telephones by minimizing the need for adjustment and alignment of individual components. Agreement was reached that "Applicant's proposed amendment, reciting a connecting member, overcomes the prior art, and a further search and consideration is required upon the amendment filed."<sup>2</sup>

Based at least on the foregoing discussion and the results of the personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejection is now moot as applied to Claim 1 and to the claims depending there from, i.e., Claims 5-9. The withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 5-9 is respectfully requested.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the interview summary, form PTOL-413, was inadvertently dated September 5, 2004.

<sup>2</sup> Interview Summary, form PTOL-413.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, reciting, among other features, a holder comprising a first component holding unit to hold an image pickup device on a main surface of a board and a second component holding unit to hold another component, wherein the component units are formed as a single piece, and the first component holding unit is designed to hold a substantial portion of a surface of the image pickup device in direct contact to the main surface of the board. As explained during the personal interview, such a structure is advantageous because it reduces the overall thickness of the portable telephone. As a non-limiting example, compare Applicants' invention shown in FIG. 7 and AAPA illustrated in FIG. 13A of Applicants' disclosure.

Applicants respectfully submit that AAPA and Imai, neither individually nor in any combination thereof, support a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the invention recited in Claim 2 because, even when combined, these references do not teach or suggest all the claimed features.

As shown in FIGS. 12 and 13A of Applicants' specification, AAPA's holder is composed of two separate pieces (see, for example, FIG. 12 of the disclosure) that are incapable of holding a substantial portion of a surface of the image pickup device in direct contact to the main surface of the board (see, for example, FIG. 13A).

Imai has been cited for disclosing a single holder mounted on a circuit board containing a plurality of holding portions. However, as clearly shown in FIG. 5 of Imai, substantial portions of surface areas of the display 4 and speaker 3 are not placed directly in contact with circuit board 2. This is so because, as shown, each holding portions has a bottom that separates the back surface of the mounted components from the circuit board. Only first conductor 3a from the speaker 3 and second conductor 4a from the display 4 reach the surface of the circuit board 2 via first and second openings, 13b and 14b, respectively.

Application No. 09/840,180  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2004

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of AAPA and Imai, does not render obvious the invention recited in Claim 2. In addition, Claims 3 and 4 which depend directly from Claim 2, are also believed to be allowed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-8 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representatives at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)